U.S. EPA REGION 6

PROPOSED PLAN AND PUBLIC COMMENT MEETING

FOR THE WILCOX OIL COMPANY SUPERFUND SITE

JULY 10, 2018,

6:00 TO 7:00 P.M.

HELD AT: BRISTOW PUBLIC LIBRARY

111 WEST 7TH AVENUE

BRISTOW, OKLAHOMA 74010

COURT REPORTER: LINDA FISHER, CSR-RPR

9956264

A p p e a r a n c e s

MS. KATRINA HIGGINS-COLTRAIN
Remedial Project Manager
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region 6
1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 (6SF-RL)
Dallas, Texas 75202-2733
(214) 665-8143
coltrain.katrina@epa.gov

MR. TODD DOWNHAM
Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality
Environmental Program Specialist
707 North Robinson
Post Office Box 1677
Oklahoma city, Oklahoma 73101-1677
(405) 702-5136
todd.downham@deq.ok.gov

MR. JASON T. MCKINNEY
Community Involvement Coordinator
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region 6
1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 (6SF-VO)
Dallas, Texas 75202-2733
(214) 665-8132
mckinney.jason@epa.gov

KATRINA HIGGINS-COLTRAIN: Good evening, everybody. I think we'll go ahead and get started. It looks like most everyone is here this evening.

I want to thank everybody for coming out and joining us this evening for this meeting. My name is Katrina Higgins-Coltrain. I am the project -- the EPA project manager for this site.

Also with me this evening is Mr. Todd Downham. He's the ODEQ project manager for the site. I just want to let everybody know we have a court reporter here this evening.

she's going to be recording everything including any comments or questions that you have about the plan. So I respectfully request that if you do have a comment or have a concern or question, that you just speak up so that she can hear you and she can record that.

So we are here this evening to talk about the source control proposed plan. Many of you are familiar with the Wilcox site. This is only one step in the process to get us closer to final site completion.

So I want everybody to remember what we're talking about here is we're just talking about source materials. We're not talking about the entire site. We still have work to do. We still have investigations, and samples to take and reports to complete.

But what we want to do here is we want to remediate some things early in the process before we're totally finished with the site investigation and the documents. Okay? So we'll just start there and move forward.

So we're going to talk a little bit about the background of the site, where we are today, what information we've gathered so far. We want to talk with you about the cleanup alternatives that we looked at for the source materials.

And we also want to let you know what our preferred alternative is for addressing those source materials. The last thing we want to know is, we want to know your comments, your concerns about what we're proposing to do.

There are some resources available to you. At the back of the room, these slides have been printed. So please get a copy, take those with you. We've also got copies of the proposed plan itself for you to take home and read.

There are additional documents here in the library. We call it the administrative record. But those documents include things like the site sampling plan. They include our data packages, and all of the work that we've done to help us in supporting this decision.

There are also two web sources for you. DEQ has a web page on Wilcox. EPA has a web page on Wilcox as well,

so if you would rather see the documents electronically, you can visit these websites, and see those.

So the comment period for this proposed plan started June 28th. It will run through the end of July. So today you can submit oral comments. The court reporter will document those for us.

You can also submit them written. At the back of the proposed plan, there is a page for you to submit your written comment if you would like to do that tonight. Or you can do that through mail, or through email through July 31st. All right.

All of these comments are going to be compiled and responded to in a final decision document. All right. So about the site. The site is in Central Oklahoma just northeast of Bristow. It is the location of a former oil refinery.

It started operation in 1915, lasted till about 1963. At this point, we are investigating a total of about 140 to 150 acres. The site consisted of two processing facilities: The Lorraine facility and the Wilcox facility. The site was finally listed on the National Priorities List in December of 2013. And that's when EPA got formally involved with the site investigation.

So as you can see, the Superfund Process is a long

process. There are multiple steps in the Superfund Process. A lot of times these steps are taken linearly. We are currently in the investigation stage.

Many of you have seen us out at the site taking samples. We've been there many times. We're investigating soils, surface water, sediment, sources, air. We're taking a lot of samples because we need to understand the contamination that's present, where is it, how much of it is there, and at what concentrations.

So what we're proposing tonight is an early or an interim action for the sources that we've identified. So as you can see, we're in the investigation stage but we've jumped ahead a couple of steps to propose an action early.

We have information, and we have data that tell us we need to address these sources. So we're proposing to do them during the investigation rather than waiting until we're done investigating the entire site.

So we've got two paths. We're continuing to investigate the site while we propose to address the sources.

We separated the site into five different operational areas. There are two processing areas, two tank farms, and a loading dock area where we believe the materials were shipped in and out of the facility.

We've used historic aerial maps and sanborn maps

to identify some of these interesting features. We also have a nice picture of the facility in operation sometime in the 1950s. So you can see the tanks. You can see the buildings. You can see the ponds. It's pretty interesting.

So we've got tanks of various sizes that held raw materials: The crude oil. Tanks that held the refined materials: the benzene, the gasoline, the diesel. We've got oil-water separation ponds, water holding ponds, cooling ponds. We also have the series of buildings in the process area where they actually heated, cracked, and refined the oil materials.

So we've been investigating the site in phases. It's a pretty large site, like I said earlier, about 140 to 150 acres. During Phase I we were worried about those residential properties that were within the boundary. Those residential properties that were within either the tank farm or the processing area.

The first thing that we did is we sampled their water wells. We also sampled the soils immediately around the homes. Data show that the ground water wells are safe to use and that there is no immediate risk associated with the soil.

So moving from there, we used geophysics and direct sensing to help us focus in on areas where contamination

could potentially be located. During Phase II -- that began in 2016 -- we started collecting environmental data. Data where we were actually taking samples and determining concentrations.

We sampled the ground water again. We wanted to verify our first run samples. Data still indicate that the water wells are safe to use. We were also interested in the air because there are structures on the site.

So we used passive gas and indoor air samples. We sampled three structures. Data tell us that these source materials have the capacity to create vapors that can get into the homes and the buildings at concentrations exceeding screening numbers.

All of these structures are vacant so we have no one being exposed at this time. We continued on. We're sampling soils, we're sampling surface water and sediment, and sources.

This is the focus for this evening. So the whole time that we've been out at the site, we've been taking samples and we've been taking note of these particular sources.

This was an oil refinery. All of these tank locations have associated with them some tank residue or sludge.

Also within the processing plant itself, when the

gasoline is being refined, they add a lead substance to the gasoline to take out additional impurities and sulfurs. All right? So in this particular instance, we've also found lead residue of exceedingly high concentrations. So that's what we're focusing on.

Here are some photos of what we're talking about. So we've identified two distinct sources that we're looking at. The three photos on the left are the tank waste. The tank waste can be found as a tar, oily substance or dark, dry-like substance at the surface.

Samples of the tank waste material show high concentrations of -- it's a big word -- polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons. This is a group of contaminants commonly found in oil products, and refined products, gasoline products.

The key contaminant here is benzo(a)pyrene. That is our focus. Benzo(a)pyrene, based on animal studies and some human studies, is a probable carcinogen. So that is our target contaminant. The tank wastes contain benzo(a)pyrene up to 12 milligrams per kilogram.

The bottom right picture is a picture of the lead additive area. So this is the residue after the gasoline was refined.

So it contains high concentrations of lead. Concentrations of lead range from 43,000 milligrams per

kilogram, parts per million, to up to 105,000 milligrams per kilogram. Very, very high. Very, very toxic.

This photograph here also in your proposed plan of materials and on a poster there at the back, if you feel you want to look at that later after the presentation, are the locations of these sources that we've located so far. The blue circles represent the tank waste material. The yellow represents the lead additive area.

Now, you'll also note that there's a green circle on this figure. In September and October of last year, we worked with our removal team and they came out and they removed 1,350 tons worth of tank waste material from this location. After the material was removed, clean soils from an off-site location were brought back and the site was revegetated.

So that leaves us with nine separate sources that we're proposing to clean up early in the process, Eight tank waste locations and the one lead source location. So why are we proposing this Interim/Early Action?

The Interim/Early Action process allows us the opportunity to do cleanup actions earlier when we have information or we have data that show that we should do something. Or if we know, based on our data, that we will have to do something later, why not propose to clean that up sooner in the process. So that's what we're doing.

It allows us to address these sources that could be a potential exposure pathway for humans or for ecological receptors for the environment. Several of these sit right on the creek so there's potential for migration or discharge to the creek. All right?

Also because we're only looking at two types of source materials, we were able to look at technologies in a streamlined fashion because we were only dealing with pretty much one type of contamination. We looked at several technologies that involve capping and treatment and excavation.

Eventually, what we found, though, is that only two alternatives really satisfied or were usable for our purposes and our source type: Excavation, treatment of the lead area with off-site disposal; or excavation, treatment of the lead area, consolidate those sources and leave them on-site capped with a protective membrane and soil.

So the proposed plan talks about three different alternatives. The No Action alternative is always included in the Superfund evaluation. It is the baseline.

It is what exists if nothing is done at the site. So basically, the site remains the same, all exposures remain, all potential migration exposure pathways remain the same.

Alternative 2 at an estimated cost of about $4.1 million is excavation with treatment and off-site disposal. Alternative 3 to the tune of about $4.6 million is excavation, treatment, consolidation, capping.

Both of these alternatives will target the health-based concentrations for lead and benzo(a)pyrene, our target contaminants for the lead additive area, and the tank waste material.

We're going to target 800 milligrams per kilogram for lead. And we're going to target 0.11 milligrams per kilogram for benzo(a)pyrene.

How do we know which alternative to select or to present? Well, we have nine evaluation criteria. We use the nine evaluation criteria to take each one of the remedies and compare against each other.

The remedies must satisfy the threshold criteria. They must be protective of human health and the environment. And they must meet state and federal regulations. That's the only way we can consider them.

The next group is the balancing criteria. This is where we look at the alternatives and we say, Okay, alternatives, how do you fit with long-term permanence and protectiveness?

How hard is it for me to implement you as a remedy compared to this guy? How much do you cost compared to

this guy? What kind of protection will I have if I implement this remedy over this remedy? So we're looking at trade-offs between the remedies to identify which one is the best for the site.

And then the third is you. This is where we want your review and your comments on what we propose for the source materials.

So how do the alternatives stack up against each other? Both alternatives have to meet the threshold criteria so they both are protective of human health and environment and they meet the federal regulations.

Both of the alternatives will take the lead source material and treat it. One difference between the two is where the sources will remain in perpetuity.

So what is the final disposition or displacement of the source materials. Under Alternative 2, the source materials will be removed from the site and sent off to a regulated, permitted disposal facility, a landfill.

In Alternative 3, the source materials will be consolidated on-site. They'll be covered with a protective membrane and capped with soil. They will remain on-site forever.

The estimated time to complete and estimated costs are relatively the same, only two months estimated difference between the two, and about $500,000 difference

in cost. It's relatively the same.

So what's the next big difference between the two? Land use restrictions. Under Alternative 2, because we're not totally complete with the site, remember, we're doing two parallel paths. We still need to investigate the site so we're not totally finished. This is an early action.

So because we don't know the full extent or the full risk of exposures, there's limited restrictions in what can be done on the property. And those are only going to be limited up until we have a final decision.

For Alternative 3, land use restrictions will be forever. We need to make sure that the capped material stays protective, nobody builds on it, nobody digs in it, nobody messes with it.

Certain land uses can't be implemented. For example, you can't build a residence on it. You probably can't build a facility on it. It all depends on, you know, how we build the cap. But there will be restrictions because of the waste.

We will have to look at the remedies because we're not done under Alternative 2. You know, we're still ongoing, we don't have a final site wide remedy. This is only early in the process. Five-year reviews will be forever for Alternative 3.

But the second or third major difference between the

two is operation and maintenance. Because the source materials will be removed from the site and placed in an off-site regulated, permitted facility, there will be no perpetual maintenance.

We won't have to come in and repair the cap. We won't have to maintain a fence. We won't have to maintain land use restrictions which will be required under Alternative 3.

So the preferred alternative: Alternative 2. We would like to propose excavation, treatment of the lead area with off-site disposal at an estimated cost of about $4.1 million. The total estimated volume is about 30,000 cubic yards which comes to an estimated five acres worth, if you add up all the areas that we're talking about.

So the preferred alternative is to take the source material, remove it from the site, dispose of it in a permitted regulated facility.

Benefits: What are the benefits of this alternative? Under this alternative we will be addressing nine separate source areas, the eight tank waste source areas, and the one lead source area.

We'll eliminate at least five migration pathways to the creek. We'll also address locations on at least four different residential properties. By doing this, we also reduce the overall risk to human health and the

environment.

So what future work remains? So right now, this is the proposed plan. After review of the data and the technologies, we propose to you Alternative 2: Excavation, Treatment, and Offsite Disposal.

Until July 31st, the proposed plan is available to you to review and comment. You submit your comments to us. We'll review those comments, respond to those comments, and make a final decision in what we'll call the Source Control Decision Document.

Once we have a decision document and we know what our cleanup alternative will be, it will have to go through a design phase. There we'll have to knock out some of the details. We'll have to identify the landfill, we'll have to identify the transporter, we'll have to identify the subcontractor, we'll have to work out some details with equipment, planning, time frame, and that sort of thing.

Once we have all that figured out, we have a timeline and a schedule, then we're ready for implementation. Our target time frame, 2019, 2020. At the same time that we're doing this work, we're still in the investigation stage.

We're still finalizing all of our data. Right now we're compiling that information. We're looking at it and

understanding the nature and extent. We're completing our reports. We're also looking at the potential risks that these contaminants may pose to human health and the environment. So there are still several steps to go before we've completed our site wide investigation.

So with that, this is our contact information, also the last slide in your packet. Thank you for coming. Any questions? Todd and I will try to answer those for you. Just, if you would, please, speak up so she can document your comment for us.

TODD DOWNHAM: Please state your name before you state your question as long as you want it on the record.

ROY WHITE: I'm Roy White. I lived on Ground Zero for about 30 years. I have gotten poisoned from that site. And I am now disabled because of the chemical poisoning. And it is documented.

I want to say something here. 15 feet down, y'all went 15 feet down with a core sample. And it was contaminated all the way down. How would that be cleaned up with an excavator? 15 feet down.

KATRINA HIGGINS-COLTRAIN: We're not --

ROY WHITE: Think about it.

KATRINA HIGGINS-COLTRAIN: Right.

ROY WHITE: That would have to be mining

equipment, large-scale mining equipment, to come in as strip mining.

TODD DOWNHAM: There are specific equipment that you can go down 15 -- it's called a long arm excavator. We've done it before on other sites, to answer that specific question.

ROY WHITE: Would it be just those little spots, or will it be the whole area?

TODD HARRIS: Well, and what we're talking about here is specific areas that aren't necessarily that deep. So these are -- tend to be in the eight to -- five to eight feet range.

So when we do -- when we did our investigations, we do go down to deeper depths. But what we're proposing in this proposed plan is once we get into the details of the actual planning phase, we're not anticipating going -- we're going as deep as we need to go to address everything in those blue areas.

So -- but to answer your question, we can go 15 feet down. We've done it before.

ROY WHITE: What about the water table throughout Bristow and Wilcox Refinery? It's all the same water table.

TODD DOWNHAM: That's a long conversation to have about ground water. And we're also still in the

phase of investigating ground water on the site.

ROY WHITE: Because I know the wells up there on property are bad.

TODD DOWNHAM: We have sampled everybody's well. For two years before EPA sampled anybody's well, I personally sampled everybody's well every three months for two years.

We never saw any issues with anybody's well, their drinking water. So but we still have to -- we still have to do some investigation on the site to --

ROY WHITE: So the wells there on the White's property is good, you're saying?

TODD DOWNHAM: There is no well -- there is no drinking water well on the White's property.

ROY WHITE: There's two of them.

TODD DOWNHAM: They're not being --

ROY WHITE: We use the city water but there are two wells there.

TODD DOWNHAM: When we started our investigation and up until currently, there is nobody drinking the ground water on the White's property.

ROY WHITE: No, there is no one drinking it now, but there are two wells there. And it is in the reservoir. And they are bad. You've stated that it was bad.

TODD DOWNHAM: We are in the process -- we haven't fully investigated ground water on the site. We're talking about two different things here. So we're talking about what we still need to do is for -- you know, the private water wells on the site are much deeper. We're talking 110, 120 feet deep. They're pulling water from a different zone than --

ROY WHITE: So you're saying this contamination is that deep?

TODD DOWNHAM: No, that's not what I'm saying. I'm saying that I have sampled -- we've sampled everyone's drinking water for --

ROY WHITE: The church water. They was using that well at one time. And it did have black stuff in the well.

TODD DOWNHAM: And again, there's nobody drinking the water on that property; so...

ROY WHITE: Not now.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And you said 20 foot down.

ROY WHITE: But at one time, they did.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: That was pulling gallons off of his well.

KATRINA HIGGINS-COLTRAIN: That, the well that had oil in it has been plugged and abandoned. So

there is no one using that well.

ROY WHITE: Right. But it's still in the reservoir.

KATRINA HIGGINS-COLTRAIN: The residential water wells are safe to use. The source control, what we're talking about are these distinct locations. We're not proposing a site wide cleanup.

We still have work to do. We still need to understand the extent of the contamination that you are referring to specifically in the process areas.

The process areas are complex. The process areas contain both raw materials, refined materials, and waste materials. So we've got gasoline issues, diesel issues, coke issues.

ROY WHITE: So in digging the dirt, what's to keep this dust debris from blowing over Bristow or any other areas that people live in?

TODD DOWNHAM: When we do this type of work, we take measures to prevent dust issues, whether it's --

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Like Collinsville?

TODD DOWNHAM: -- spraying water down to keep the dust down. That's -- those are all details that we work out in the design phase.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Like Collinsville?

TODD DOWNHAM: We do air monitoring. We make sure that -- we realize dust can be a problem so we take measures to prevent that.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And you're saying from 2013. I've pulled up reports from 1989 from the EPA off of the internet showing thallium, arsenic, radium, and everything else out on these properties. Why weren't the people informed of it?

ROY WHITE: That's what I was asking about is everything safe.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We are here to get the people to help.

TODD DOWNHAM: 1989?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes. And I'll put them on a Facebook page for people to see. And they are documented from y'all and signed off.

KATRINA HIGGINS-COLTRAIN: We also have reports on our web page. We also have reports available for you here in the library to look at. During the investigation process, data are collected, and the data are collected in order to determine whether the site needs to be placed on the National Priorities List.

So what I can speak to is that since 2013 -- I became the project manager in 2015 -- we have been working to try to address the issues here at the property. So I

cannot speak to what happened in the past.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: What I'm seeing --

KATRINA HIGGINS-COLTRAIN: But we are trying to address what we're finding currently.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So what I'm seeing is y'all are milking the flock.

TODD DOWNHAM: Ma'am, --

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: You all have got documents from 1989 until now. And you didn't go backwards and check? Someone ain't doing their homework. There was thallium that got banned in 1975 on the White's property and thallium got banned in the United States.

TODD DOWNHAM: The first report the DEQ produced on that site is from 1994; so...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Well, I've got reports showing it.

TODD DOWNHAM: Okay.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And people signing off on it.

TODD DOWNHAM: So we're in the process of investigation the site to understand the risks that are present so we can come up with a plan to address those risks. That's why we're here tonight.

So the site sat for many years without anything happening to it. And DEQ didn't always exist. You didn't

always have --

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: You should have got all these people off the property when you found it out, every single one of them. They should not ever have been out there on that property. A bunch of my friends are dying from this shit. Sorry for the language.

TODD DOWNHAM: Anybody has a right to buy a piece of property and move onto it. There aren't --

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We would really like to know what's on there before we move out there.

TODD DOWNHAM: That is part of a larger discussion. And it has to do with -- there's a lot more things to talk about with regard to that.

ROY WHITE: $350,000 homes.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah.

TODD DOWNHAM: There are sites across the state that we are in the process of investigating. There are sites we haven't discovered yet; so...

ROY WHITE: If they had told me back then -- if they would have told me back then, these people wouldn't have been on there, and built $250,000 homes. And now I've got this problem in my system. I'm not able to do -- work anymore.

TODD DOWNHAM: I understand your frustration.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: That (indiscernible) boy, you told him he could stay out there; it was perfectly safe. You did.

TODD DOWNHAM: Ma'am, I believe you're misspeaking. But we can talk afterwards, if you'd like.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: No. We want to have it on the record.

TODD DOWNHAM: Well, okay.

ROY WHITE: But that's all right.

TODD DOWNHAM: Okay. There are answers to everything you're speaking of. But we would like to keep the focus to specific questions, which is our plan this evening. Some of these questions have complex answers that this may not be the right place to discuss them, but so...

ROY WHITE: My dad has worked for the Corps of Engineers. I practically lived in the Corps of Engineers building when he was -- when he worked with the Corps of Engineers. I know you start stirring up things up there it's going to be a mudhole.

TODD DOWNHAM: That's right. We --

ROY WHITE: And you cannot --

TODD DOWNHAM: -- and we take measures to prevent any dust or migrations that would affect adjacent properties or any of the public. We take extensive safety

precautions to prevent that. The workers on the site, the public. We monitor the air.

We take a lot of measures to prevent air (indiscernible). We work with the community. It's a very detailed process. I can assure you of that.

KATRINA HIGGINS-COLTRAIN: Anyone else have questions?

MICHAEL BLASCHKE: I just have three questions kind of interrelated.

TODD DOWNHAM: Please state your name, sir.

MICHAEL BLASCHKE: I am Michael Blaschke, B-l-a-s-c-h-k-e. I am counsel for some of the families that formerly did move on the site.

Source, I take it that means that you've identified the source of all the pollution? Is that what that word means here in this context?

TODD DOWNHAM: When you say "all the pollution," you mean all the pollution on site?

MICHAEL BLASCHKE: The source of all the contaminants came from these things you're cleaning up. Is that what that word means? I'm -- it's really just a technical question I'm trying to understand.

TODD DOWNHAM: "Source" meaning a defined area that --

MICHAEL BLASCHKE: Are there other source

areas?

TODD DOWNHAM: Potentially, yes.

MICHAEL BLASCHKE: Okay.

TODD DOWNHAM: But we're still in the process of --

MICHAEL BLASCHKE: Understood.

TODD DOWNHAM: -- investigating the first site.

MICHAEL BLASCHKE: Table 3 -- I'm terrible at arithmetic -- but it looks like your lead table is 131 times what you would like it to be, roughly?

TODD DOWNHAM: We're talking about industrial or residential lead levels; is that what you mean?

MICHAEL BLASCHKE: Yeah, it's Table 3. You list the health-based screening, that was 800. And the data results are 105,000. I simply did the math. It's 131 times too high.

TODD DOWNHAM: Okay. That's probably right.

KATRINA HIGGINS-COLTRAIN: Yes. The lead concentrations are extremely high. We're talking, in this particular context, probably percent lead.

We should probably talk about percent lead rather than concentration. And we are very concerned about these

concentrations because it's not even safe for an industrial worker to be in the area without some type of respiratory protection.

MICHAEL BLASCHKE: And I understand that 105 was only the highest one found. It may vary a little.

KATRINA HIGGINS-COLTRAIN: That was the highest.

MICHAEL BLASCHKE: Your benzopyrene -- again I'm not good with arithmetic -- but it looks to be 100 times what it should be, .11 times 100?

KATRINA HIGGINS-COLTRAIN: It is two orders of magnitude larger.

MICHAEL BLASCHKE: 800.

KATRINA HIGGINS-COLTRAIN: So we're talking about a cleanup level of .1. And we have concentrations of 12. So, yes, we have high concentrations.

MICHAEL BLASCHKE: And my last question -- these really are questions based on ignorance -- is looking on page 7, first full paragraph right inside, "Results for samples collected from the tank waste are as high..." as blah, blah, blah.

"These wastes are not identified as listed hazardous wastes and data results indicate that the tank waste is not a characteristic hazardous waste."

I don't understand that.

KATRINA HIGGINS-COLTRAIN: Okay. These are regulatory terms.

MICHAEL BLASCHKE: I thought so.

KATRINA HIGGINS-COLTRAIN: The resource -- Resource Conservation Recovery --

MICHAEL BLASCHKE: Resource Conservation Recovery Act.

KATRINA HIGGINS-COLTRAIN: Act. Yes. Sorry. RCRA. I'm used to acronyms, never spelling them out.

Under RCRA, they have promulgated and passed what they call listed hazardous waste. So no matter where you find this material, it is designated by law as a hazardous waste.

If you have a hazardous waste, it can only be disposed of in a regulated and permitted hazardous waste landfill. So the waste that we have is not a listed regulatory hazardous waste. So we're not bound by disposing of the material in a hazardous waste landfill.

Now, the second piece of that is that there are certain restrictions on disposing of waste, what they call land ban restrictions. So there are certain criteria that your wastes have to meet in order to be disposed in one of these facilities. 261.24 I think is the number.

So the second step that or hurdle that you have to

cross is that you sample your waste, and it must meet the criteria for toxicity, radioactivity, combustion, and radioactivity. So we're not radioactive. We're not combustible.

What we're busting is toxicity. Because the lead in the lead additive area will leach or dissolve out of the solid phase. And what we have to do is we have to treat that material so the lead does not leach out.

We have to solidify it and make a solid cohesive material out of it. So that's done through stabilization, solidification. That's just a big term for saying we're going to turn something that's granular or liquid into something solid.

And we do that simply by adding cement or lime or fly ash, something as simple as that that will bind the lead and keep it from leaching out or dissolving out from the solid material.

MICHAEL BLASCHKE: So the fact that these wastes are not listed in a technical sense has nothing to do with their toxicity or lack of toxicity?

KATRINA HIGGINS-COLTRAIN: Correct.

MICHAEL BLASCHKE: Thank you.

KATRINA HIGGINS-COLTRAIN: It is just a regulatory term for disposal.

MICHAEL BLASCHKE: Okay. That's all I

have. Thank you.

BOB JACKMAN: My name is Bob Jackman. I'm a geologist from Tulsa. But this is kind of a backyard hometown to me.

Whose -- is it EPA's responsibility -- we hear we have toxic materials here. No question about it. You've identified them. You didn't cause them, but you have identified them.

Is it your responsibility to advise this community to have, like, the Oklahoma Department of Health to run tests? Do we have cancer anomalies clusters here?

What is the current health hazards caused -- being caused by this site, which you did not cause which you're trying to clean up. But is there sufficient -- isn't there -- isn't there is a question and a statement.

Isn't there sufficient information being given to the general public as to what exactly can happen with contamination by lead? You've got one particular type of benzoid.

There's another type or two. So that's my question. Who is responsible to be advising the health risks that are being incurred right now today until 2020 when you are completely finished?

KATRINA HIGGINS-COLTRAIN: I'm not a physician. I cannot advise you based on your health

concerns. That is between you and your doctor. I do have a contact for the agency for toxic substances and disease registry that you can talk with, and we can also get you a contact with the Oklahoma Department of Health. Now, what we have tried to do in this particular instance is post the information, as soon as we get it, to our web page. We've held conversations with the property owners on a regular basis. And we've also come out here on a routine basis to share with you what we're finding.

As mentioned earlier, we still have investigation to do and we still have the risk assessment to do. The risk assessment will give us more information about the potential risks that these contaminants are posing based on certain exposures and based on location.

BOB JACKMAN: Should you have a representative from the Oklahoma Department of Health at these community hearings?

KATRINA HIGGINS-COLTRAIN: We have had agency representatives here and the Oklahoma Department of Health representatives here at a couple of meetings.

BOB JACKMAN: Thank you.

KATRINA HIGGINS-COLTRAIN: Any more questions?

STACY MARTIN: Yeah. My name is Stacy Martin. Over on 8th Street, there's a bridge that they

took out. And if I recall, they had to remove all the dirt, because it was contaminated, and bring new dirt in.

Well, that was on that creek. And that creek borders my property on two sides. How am I going to know or when will I know if my property is contaminated?

KATRINA HIGGINS-COLTRAIN: We've taken surface water and sediment samples and that's the data that we're trying to work through right now. So as soon as we get information, and we understand what that information means, we will be talking to you.

STACY MARTIN: I mean, because, yeah, it's kind of scary.

JEFF SARGEANT: I just -- my name is Jeff Sargeant (phonetic). I live here in Bristow. I see in your materials you're going to dig down two feet subsurface, and you're talking about covering up with those materials, fly ash. And I'm just wondering if you'd ever looked at biodegradation technology molecularly to clean this up whereas it fights it kind of like something fights cancer.

KATRINA HIGGINS-COLTRAIN: One of the alternatives looked at in the screening process was land farming which is essentially what you're talking about, bioremediation.

Bioremediation is effective on organic material so

the tank waste material. It would not be effective on the lead metals materials.

The land farming process takes years. And it primarily is more effective when you have soils that are contaminated with organics rather than actual source materials like we have here.

So there was some question about how effective it would be. And there was a lot of uncertainty related to extent of treatment that would be needed for the tank waste material. And there was question about whether there would be residual that would still have to be managed by disposing of it off-site.

JEFF SARGEANT: Okay. Well, it's not all tank waste. And it wouldn't all be the lead. So we've got the benzene and the other chemicals.

KATRINA HIGGINS-COLTRAIN: We're not -- we're not to that stage yet.

JEFF SARGEANT: Okay.

KATRINA HIGGINS-COLTRAIN: Right.

JEFF SARGEANT: So you may address that in the future?

KATRINA HIGGINS-COLTRAIN: Right. So we're still investigating the site which means that there will be another step where we talk about site wide and we talk about a site wide remediation strategy that would address

some of these other contaminated areas.

JEFF SARGEANT: Okay. Last I knew, there were 807 plus deaths from cancer when everyone started this back in '13, and your organizations came into this. And those have grown. There's a lot of sick people.

Initially, that was at another site. And then you guys went to this site. And so I just wondered if the cancer is going to be addressed at some point.

KATRINA HIGGINS-COLTRAIN: Again, I can get you a contact for ATSDR. We can give you contact for Oklahoma Department of Health and let you talk with them about health risks and cancer risks.

JEFF SARGEANT: Okay.

ELSIE GEORGE: My name is Elsie George. I was wondering where would this material be disposed of, what off-site spot?

KATRINA HIGGINS-COLTRAIN: We believe that it will be one of the land fills in Tulsa. When our removal team was out in September and October, they found a landfill in Tulsa that was regulated and permitted and able to accept the waste.

So they were successful in removing that material and shipping it to Tulsa, and disposing of it there. So we anticipate that it would be that one or one similar within Tulsa.

DUSTIN TREVOR: Hi. Dustin Trevor (phonetic) with Channel 6. My first question is: How is the waste going to be transported from Bristow to Tulsa?

KATRINA HIGGINS-COLTRAIN: It will be transported by truck.

DUSTIN TREVOR: Okay. What kind of a truck? Are we talking about an enclosed truck?

KATRINA HIGGINS-COLTRAIN: That's one of the details that we'll work through in the design. But the trucks will be decontaminated before they leave the site. The preference and the request will be that they be tarped and contained, and that the drivers have a safe driving record, obviously.

DUSTIN TREVOR: And then what do I need to worry about? I'm a resident here. I'm, you know -- until this cleanup plan is put into motion for the next six months, eight months, ten months, what do I need to be worried about as a resident here in Bristow?

I mean, you know, how can I sleep soundly tonight? What can you tell me that will help me go to bed tonight until this plan starts?

KATRINA HIGGINS-COLTRAIN: These areas are finite in location and they're specific to these locations. We feel like we have them determined both laterally and horizontally. And they are within fenced

areas. So as long as you --

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: The grid/rig wasn't in a fenced area.

KATRINA HIGGINS-COLTRAIN: That's a separate instance than these nine sources.

DUSTIN TREVOR: Thank you, ma'am.

PAULA JOHNSON: You're not saying then that you have identified all of the potential contaminants on the site as a whole?

KATRINA HIGGINS-COLTRAIN: Correct.

PAULA JOHNSON: You're just addressing these specific ones. So there could be a whole host of other potential contaminants.

KATRINA HIGGINS-COLTRAIN: Correct.

PAULA JOHNSON: And according to this for future work, you're looking at 2019 or 2020 for the completion of this. Do you have any estimate of when your data gathering and investigation will finish on the rest of the site and when you will get a final proposal?

KATRINA HIGGINS-COLTRAIN: I do not. Our work is funding dependent. So as we receive funding, we work together with as much information as we can.

I do know that we have additional work to do so we do need to look at the ground water. We do need to look at additional soil locations.

We do need to look at our risk assessment. So a process. I expect that it will be sometime after 2020. I'm just not certain.

PAULA JOHNSON: On comparable sites, --

TODD DOWNHAM: State your name one more time.

PAULA JOHNSON: Paula Johnson.

TODD DOWNHAM: Can you stand up.

PAULA JOHNSON: I'm short. So when I stand up, it doesn't make much difference. On comparable sites just as an estimate, what's your time frame?

KATRINA HIGGINS-COLTRAIN: Ten plus years.

DENICE ASHLEY: Just a curious question. Since this was listed with the Environmental Protection Agency in 2013, would it have been advised that any properties that were within or around that site, would it have -- would there have been a duty to report that to a consumer? To a buyer? To an investor? Is there any type of standard practice?

KATRINA HIGGINS-COLTRAIN: We -- we have had conversations -- we have had conversations with the property owners as long as I've been project manager in 2015. I know that since Todd has been working on the site, he has had regular conversations with the property owners.

No new property owners have bought property since we've been working on this site. So we have regular conversations with them and share with them what we're doing, what we're finding.

DENICE ASHLEY: So you're referencing within the site, no new properties or no -- nothing has been sold since 2013. But would there have been a duty to share that information by realtors or loan officers that would have -- or is that just way out of -- I mean, this is kind of out of your league as far as your --

TODD DOWNHAM: I'm not familiar with the specific real estate disclosure laws.

DENICE ASHLEY: Okay.

TODD DOWNHAM: But maybe somebody in here is. I don't know.

JASON MCKINNEY: I can comment --

KATRINA HIGGINS-COLTRAIN: Who -- who are you?

JASON MCKINNEY: I'm sorry. I'm Jason McKinney. I'm with the EPA. I can't comment for Oklahoma but I do know in Texas that you -- if your house is sitting on a Superfund Site, you have to disclose that. You can't sell it without that.

DENICE ASHLEY: Adjacent to as well?

JASON MCKINNEY: I'm sorry?

DENICE ASHLEY: Adjacent to?

JASON MCKINNEY: If it's near, yes. I'm not sure what -- I can't say but I do know that you do have to disclose it.

TODD DOWNHAM: But is your question more directed to prior to Superfund status?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I just bought mine two and a half years ago.

TODD DOWNHAM: Okay. And but you're not on the site, --

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: No.

TODD DOWNHAM: -- within the site boundary. But are you asking more about before it was --

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: No. Well, after 2013. Any sites that would be adjacent to. Because you've already confirmed that basically you're not fully aware of all of the contamination, you're still exploring it, and investigating.

And I appreciate all your work. I really do but I do wonder if there's a duty to disclose as a land -- you know, people purchase properties that are adjacent to.

KATRINA HIGGINS-COLTRAIN: We have -- we have regular community meetings and we try to get the word out. I think your question is more specific to state regulations and laws pertaining to buying and selling real

estate, disclosures, and those sorts of things.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you.

BETH WRIGHT: My name is Beth Wright.

TODD DOWNHAM: Would you state your name one more time, please.

BETH WRIGHT: Beth Wright.

TODD DOWNHAM: Can you spell your name, please.

BETH WRIGHT: My name is Beth Wright, W-r-i-g-h-t. I was just wondering, since this stuff is in the air, how far south do you think these contaminants that you know of so far have gone?

KATRINA HIGGINS-COLTRAIN: We've only found these in the structures when we sampled in the structures. We did not find them outside the structures.

The structures sometimes will act as a source for concentrating vapors. When you run your air-conditioning and your heater, vapors will get in through migration pathways and up into the home and can concentrate.

So we've only found them in the structures. These structures are not occupied. And we did not find them when we did perimeter sampling.

BETH WRIGHT: Thank you.

KATRINA HIGGINS-COLTRAIN: Anyone else have any questions? All right. Well, thank you for coming.

Please, on the back of your proposed plan here, you will see that there's a sheet. If you want to submit some written comments, please do that. Take a look at some of our photographs here, if you like. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the proceedings were concluded.)

CERTIFICATE

STATE OF OKLAHOMA)
COUNTY OF TULSA) ss.

I, Linda Fisher, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, Registered Professional Reporter, and Notary Public in the State of Oklahoma, do hereby certify that on the 10th day of July, 2018, at the Bristow Public Library, 111 West 7th Avenue, Bristow, Oklahoma, the within and foregoing TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC MEETING was reduced to writing by me in stenograph, and thereafter transcribed by me, and is fully and accurately set forth in the preceding pages.

I do further certify that I am not related to nor attorney for any of the said parties, nor otherwise interested in the event of said action.

WITNESS my hand and official seal this 16th day of July, 2018.

Linda K. Fisher, CSR-RPR

Linda Fisher, CSR-RPR #866